

Date: Thu, 24 Jun 93 04:30:21 PDT
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V93 #204
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Thu, 24 Jun 93 Volume 93 : Issue 204

Today's Topics:

 Blind VEs (2 msgs)
 NQOI: What I would do. (2 msgs)
 NQOI Case : HF Vertical Antennas (2 msgs)

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: Wed, 23 Jun 1993 15:32:02 GMT
From: pravda.sdsc.edu!news.cerf.net!usc!howland.reston.ans.net!gatech!asuvax!
ennews!enuxva.eas.asu.edu!shandrow@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: Blind VEs
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

I agree with the idea that there should be a exam proctoring/administering
test for those who wish to be VE's. Also, the blind must be permitted to
take this exam using alternative techniques, such as a reader, to prove
his/her ability to administer an exam. You see, it's still the same thing.
Such a test will not be permitted to exclude the blind.

Date: 23 Jun 1993 23:06:45 -0500
From: usc!cs.utexas.edu!gerald.cc.utexas.edu!doc.cc.utexas.edu!not-for-
mail@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: Blind VEs
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

I'd like to apologise to both Gary and Jack at this point. I cut out quite a bit of text because I wanted to comment on just a few things, and my silly news reader wouldn't let me put more of what they said in.

I usually try to include *all* of the other person's article if I'm going to comment on it, because I don't want to quote the other person out of context or altar the meaning of their work. This is I believe, only fair.

Jack, W4PPT wrote in article # 1737

>> the appearance of impropriety must be avoided.
>This turn is interesting to me, and I think it goes way beyond the
>"rights of the blind" issues of before. It is exactly the APPEARANCE
>OF IMPROPRIETY that makes the situation as it is, not a "legal"
>interpretation.

The problem for the blind, is that this "appearance of impropriety" is based on the erroneous assumption that we are incabable of competing on terms of equality with our sighted counterparts in the area of exam proctoring.

And I quite agree that it can be taken beyond the issue that brought up this whole discussion in the first place. And the solution is to drop *all* preconcieved notions about the blind, and *all* other groups, and test each prospective VE for proficiency in exam proctoring.

>Then too, perhaps the flood of new hams and upgrades have clogged the
>que for the ARRL VEC, but I have been "in the queue" for a long time
>awaiting the paperwork to be filled out *before* I can become an
>examiner, and that seems to be a simple secretarial job to stick a
>bunch of material in an envelope and lick a stamp (heck, they spent
>money on modernizinf 225 Main Street...I betcha they even have a
>postage meter) and send it off. Before I imply that Newington is not
>responsive, it may be the USPS who swallowed it!

Yes, a great many of the mundanities of being a VE *do* seem to consist mainly of secretarial duties, don't they? Perhaps any proposed tests of VE competence should include a secretarial element. B-)

>> I think that they are very very reluctant to allow anything that
>> would make the exam process appear to be even less closely controlled
>> than it is. Unlicensed observers are just such a thing. (Though as
>> I've said before, holding an Extra class license doesn't automatically
>> make someone a qualified proctor.)
>Here, I must agree with Gary, and there is NOTHING in his comments
>that precludes blind, nor INCLUDES sighted purely on the basis of
>visual acuity.

I agree with everything that Gary wrote in the paragraph above, with the exception of his reference to "unlicensed observers." That phrase refers to live readers, who are used by the blind. I won't get into a long, drawn-out description of what readers are here though. We the blind, who are experienced with readers have explained what they are in previous articles.

We are asking the FCC to allow us to use **all** of our alternative techniques to get the job done. They might include live readers, and they might not.

>> This issue goes beyond the physical impairments of some VE candidates.
>> I don't think flight physicals are the answer, but certified observers
>> certainly would be a step in the right direction.

Agreed. If the FCC is beginning to have second thoughts about the VE process, then let them test volunteer examiners to determine the level of their proctoring skills. But let this be done on a basis of equality with no biases or preconceptions about certain groups of people.

>73
>Jack, W4PPT

73 to All!

--
David Milner | ***** | Amateur Radio Callsign N 5 R U L (R/R # 3)
(GeNie) D.MILNER | * Moo! * | (Internet) aggedor@ccwf.cc.utexas.edu
Austin, Tx. U.S.A. | ***** | I know who I am, and I will **NEVER** go back!
*** Illegitimus Non Carborundom Est! (Don't let the bastards get you down!) ***

Date: 23 Jun 93 16:29:56 CDT
From: usc!howland.reston.ans.net!math.ohio-state.edu!uwm.edu!msuinfo!uchinews!
raistlin!timbuk.cray.com!hemlock.cray.com!cherry10!dadams@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: NQOI: What I would do.
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

What I would do if I were NQOI:

I would bring in a bull dozer, and loads and loads of fill dirt, and heap up a massive hill in the back yard that was say 35 feet tall. Then I would

erect a 35 foot antenna on the top. ;^)

David, NOWWN

--David C. Adams Statistician Cray Research Inc. dadams@cray.com
-Sourdough and Ham- - Minnesotans for Global Warming! -
(&gardner)

Date: Thu, 24 Jun 1993 04:46:29 GMT
From: pa.dec.com!nntpd2.cxo.dec.com!nuts2u.enet.dec.com!little@decwrl.dec.com
Subject: NQ0I: What I would do.
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

dadams@cray.com (David Adams) writes:

>What I would do if I were NQ0I:

>

>I would bring in a bull dozer, and loads and loads of fill dirt, and heap up
>a massive hill in the back yard that was say 35 feet tall. Then I would
>erect a 35 foot antenna on the top. ;^)

Yeah, but if their zoning laws are anything like the ones around here, you can't change the grade of your property more than something like 6" without a permit, and then even with a permit, only a bit more than that. 2' is probably beyond the limit, much less 35'.

I had thought of a similar thing to get my antennas more than 10' above the roof of my house by building a 10' cupola and going 10' above it.

73,
Todd
N9MWB

Date: Wed, 23 Jun 1993 14:08:55 GMT
From: sdd.hp.com!col.hp.com!fc.hp.com!jayk@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: NQ0I Case : HF Vertical Antennas
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Darrell B Shandrow (shandrow@enuxva.eas.asu.edu) wrote:

: I have been following this thread as pretty closely. It seems that it
: would be a good idea to set some sort of minimum tower height which should
: be permitted. 40 feet seems like a good number. With a 40 foot tower you
: can put up a couple of good antennas and work great dx. It is also enough

: height to put up some good vhf/uhf/microwave antennas for satellites, weak
: signal, eme, and other modes.

I guess it depends on what you want to do. IMHO 40 feet is way too low.
I like to work DX. I have four elements on 20 meters at 38 feet. At the
beginning and ending of the DX opening, when the angle is low, I get
crushed by anyone with a small tribander at 60 feet. As the sunspots
decline this will only get worse.

I have a three element 40 meter beam at 38 feet. This is way too low
for a 40 meter antenna. It performs fairly well but is so close to the
ground that the SWR curve doesn't have a proper dip.

73, Jay Kesterson K0GU jayk@fc.hp.com

Date: Wed, 23 Jun 1993 16:20:55 GMT
From: sdd.hp.com!swrinde!emory!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary@decwrl.dec.com
Subject: NQ0I Case : HF Vertical Antennas
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1993Jun20.230931.20746@leland.Stanford.EDU> paulf@umunhum.stanford.edu
(Paul Flaherty) writes:

>In article <25599@druwx.ATT.COM> n2ic@druwa.ATT.COM (LondonSM) writes:

>>Now, let's look at suburbia. You set up your phased verticals in the
>>backyard of your 1/4 acre palace.

>

>Strawman #1: Limited Area. Limited area will negatively impact your
>antenna system, *no matter what you do*. In the situation you've outlined,
>you wouldn't have the setback for tower you're comparing.

Not necessarily. Many zoning ordinances don't require special setbacks
for *self supporting* structures. The normal 5 foot setback from the
property line required for other auxillary structures is sufficient.

>>Since each of your verticals presents a different
>>impedance, due to the presence of objects in the near field, how are you
>>going to achieve the phase relationships needed for your array ?

>

>Strawman #3: Impedance Mania. You really have to try hard to mess up the
>feed impedance of verticals, as opposed to horizontal systems, because of the
>prevalance of horizontal metal structures. No, it really isn't that tough
>to get four or even nine verticals to 50 ohms.

???? This is a hard problem even for commercial broadcast arrays operating
in open fields over massive fields of ground radials. If you find it easy
to get the proper base impedance at each tower, there's probably something

wrong with your antenna system. :-)

>>How are you going to improve your ground system without
>>burying a zillion radials in your backyard, AS WELL AS YOUR NEIGHBORS BACKYARD ?
>
>Strawman #4: Those lossy 1/4 wave verticals. Use sleeve dipoles, which get
>you above most obstructions, are unbalanced, don't require a ground radial
>system, and if you really want low loss, silver plate them to skin depth.
>Incidentally, I'll bet the sleeve dipoles will survive winds far in
>excess of that which will fold the tower - yagi combination.

You've just doubled the height of your "low profile" antennas. Sleeve
dipoles aren't *supposed* to be unbalanced radiators, they just usually
wind up that way. I doubt that a solid sleeve will present less windload
for it's strength than an open lattice tower.

Gary

--
Gary Coffman KE4ZV | You make it, | gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
Destructive Testing Systems | we break it. | uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary
534 Shannon Way | Guaranteed! | emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
Lawrenceville, GA 30244 | |

Date: Wed, 23 Jun 1993 04:54:38 GMT
From: agate!howland.reston.ans.net!gatech!asuvax!ennews!anasaz!misty!
john@ames.arpa
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <randall.740451861@moose>, <C8z8rp.3AJ@cbnewsk.cb.att.com>,
<204so8\$dn0@news.acns.nwu.edu>
Subject : Re: First Amendment and NQ0I was Re: Childish posts on the NQ01 case:

rdewan@casbah.acns.nwu.edu (Rajiv Dewan) writes:

]In article <C8z8rp.3AJ@cbnewsk.cb.att.com> n8afd@cbnewsk.cb.att.com
(carl.h.bohman..jr) writes:
]>Its a shame in my opinion that everyone has to worry about what
]>his neighbor thinks, I thought thats what our country was founded
]>on, individual freedom.
]>I submit that all CCRs with respect to amateurs is a violation of
]>the first amendment, freedom of speech. After all aren't CCRs restricting
]>you 1st amendment right, even if your not an amateur. You aren't free
]> ...
] (A few lines have been deleted for brevity.)

]I am not a lawyer, but as with many constitutional arguments, a balance
]has to be made among competing rights. Counteracting the right to free
]speech is the right to write contracts with others. After all a CC&R
]is nothing but a contract between a buyer and a seller. The buyer agrees
]to the contract while purchasing the property.

You're right.

This "free speech" argument is a silly strawman. In theory, the CC&R's
are signed VOLUNTARILY. That means that you VOLUNTARILY AGREED to limit
your use of the property.

This has nothing to do with constitutional free speech rights, which only
restrict what the GOVERNMENT can do to you.

--

John Moore NJ7E, 7525 Clearwater Pkwy, Scottsdale, AZ 85253 (602-951-9326)
john@anasazi.com ncar!noao!asuvax!anasaz!john anasaz!john@asuvax.eas.asu.edu
- - Support ALL of the bill of rights, INCLUDING the 2nd amendment! - -
- - - "It is better to be judged by twelve, than carried by six." - - -

Date: Wed, 23 Jun 1993 21:28:20 GMT
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!news.ucdavis.edu!othello.ucdavis.edu!
ez006683@network.UCSD.EDU
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <randall.740451861@moose>, <C8z8rp.3AJ@cbnewsk.cb.att.com>,
<1993Jun23.163256.2638@ke4zv.uucp>
Subject : Re: Childish posts on the NQ01 case:

Gary Coffman (gary@ke4zv.uucp) wrote:
: locate where they are allowed. It's better to be at least a rifle
: shot away from the nearest whining neighbor and their bratty kids
: anyway.

Is this to reduce the temptation factor? :-)

Dan

--

```
*-----*
* Daniel D. Todd      Packet: KC6UUD@WA6RDH.#nocal.ca.usa      *
*                   Internet: DDTODD@ucdavis.edu                *
*                   Snail Mail: 1750 Hanover #102               *
*                   Davis CA 95616                             *
*-----*
*       I do not speak for the University of California....    *
```

* and it sure as hell doesn't speak for me!! *

Date: Wed, 23 Jun 1993 16:32:56 GMT
From: sdd.hp.com!swrinde!gatech!emory!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary@decwrl.dec.com
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993Jun16.162531.23480@en.ecn.purdue.edu>, <randall.740451861@moose>,
<C8z8rp.3AJ@cbnewsk.cb.att.com>=
Reply-To : gary@ke4zv.UUCP (Gary Coffman)
Subject : Re: Childish posts on the NQ01 case:

In article <C8z8rp.3AJ@cbnewsk.cb.att.com> n8afd@cbnewsk.cb.att.com
(carl.h.bohman..jr) writes:
>Its a shame in my opinion that everyone has to worry about what
>his neighbor thinks, I thought thats what our country was founded
>on, individual freedom.
>I submit that all CCRs with respect to amateurs is a violation of
>the first amendment, freedom of speech. After all aren't CCRs restricting
>you 1st amendment right, even if your not an amateur. You aren't free
>to install the means of how you want to use your freedom of expression.
>I'm sure you couldn't get a CCR through that did not permit telephone
>lines. With respect to NQ01, if there are commercial TV and radio
>installations then hasn't his equal protection rights been violated?
>73, N8AFD

Actually there are CCRs that require underground telephone and power
cabling. You'd probably be allowed to "erect" underground antenna
arrays in such subdivisions, so there's your equal protection. Note,
you can't put a printing plant in your backyard either, so freedom
of the press is muted. But that's OK, because there are commercial
and industrially zoned areas where such things are appropriate. The
courts view radio transmitters, and their antenna arrays, similarly
to printing presses. You can't setup a printing plant wherever you
choose, and you can't establish a transmitting plant wherever you
choose. But you can setup either one in the appropriate areas.
So the lesson to be learned is, if you want a transmitting plant,
locate where they are allowed. It's better to be at least a rifle
shot away from the nearest whining neighbor and their bratty kids
anyway.

Gary

--

| | | | | |
|-----------------------------|--|--------------|--|--------------------------|
| Gary Coffman KE4ZV | | You make it, | | gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary |
| Destructive Testing Systems | | we break it. | | uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary |

534 Shannon Way | Guaranteed! | emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
Lawrenceville, GA 30244 | | |

Date: 23 Jun 93 15:30:40 GMT

From: olivea!gossip.pyramid.com!pyramid!infmx!woof!randall@ames.arpa

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <C8z8rp.3AJ@cbnewsk.cb.att.com>, <204so8\$dn0@news.acns.nwu.edu>,
<C90suq.18z@cbnewsk.cb.att.com>

Subject : Re: First Amendment and NQ0I was Re: Childish posts on the NQ01 case:

n8afd@cbnewsk.cb.att.com (carl.h.bohman..jr) writes:

>Your missing my whole point, there ***cannot exist*** a balance between
>CCRs and what you sign away. You are guarenteed these rights in the Bill
>of Rights unconditionally.

There are no unconditional rights. Each right is often in conflict
with another right, requiring rights to be evaluated and prioritized.
Almost every Supreme Court case involves confict of rights.
In this case, rights of organizations and individuals to enter
into private contracts is in conflict with the rights of an
individual to erect a structure on his/her properly.

Free speech has definatue conditions. I can say "Clinton is a
corrupt ninny", but I cannot say "Let's go out and shoot that
Clinton."

> This in my opinion makes CCRs void in the
>first place since they are an illegal contract. Aren't illegal contracts
>unenforceable?
>Maybe I'm missing some fine lawyer point (I am not a lawyer), but how can
>a contract that abridges your free speech rights be enforced?

Antenna restrictions do not affect one's free speech right. The First
Amendment is designed to protect an individual from getting into
trouble with the government over something he/she says. You can
get on 20 meters and say "I think Clinton and Congress are a bunch
of corrupt ninnies", and the First Amendment protects you from
government prosecution (but not on-the-air flames). The Amendment
does not protect you when you put up a tower and a 20-meter monobander.

--

=====

Randall Rhea

Informix Software, Inc.

Project Manager, MIS Sales/Marketing Systems uunet!pyramid!infmx!randall

Date: Wed, 23 Jun 93 13:25:10 GMT
From: walter!porthos!dancer!whs70@uunet.uu.net
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1vm2f5\$q6u@hp-col.col.hp.com>, <C8q7EA.Fzp@inews.intel.com>,
<1993Jun22.165711.462@walter.cray.com>
Subject : Re: NQ0I Loses Big PRB-1 Antenna Case

In article <1993Jun22.165711.462@walter.cray.com> wws@craywr.cray.com (Walter Spector) writes:

>I think that new CC+Rs are written the way they are due to cooperation with
>the cable TV companies. ("Hey Mr. Developer - put these restrictions against
>TV antennas in your CC+Rs and I will wire the houses for free..."). Later on,
>clueless neighbors and planning boards get to defend the cable TV companies'
>monopoly - screwing hams, and themselves, in the process..

Why would the state or local planning board get involved in the enforcement of CC&Rs? The CC&R requirements/constraints are a private contract that would in no way involve any official enforcement by the local municipality. The only way CC&Rs can be enforced is by the "owners association" or a neighbor(s) filing a civil lawsuit against the owner of the CC&R violation. No planning board I've ever heard of ever gets involved in CC&R disputes. The only thing planning boards or local zoning officials can enforce are the local/state municipal land use laws/municipal zoning laws.

Standard Disclaimer- Any opinions, etc. are mine and NOT my employer's.

Bill Sohl (K2UNK) BELLCORE (Bell Communications Research, Inc.)
Morristown, NJ email via UUCP bcr!cc!whs70
201-829-2879 Weekdays email via Internet whs70@cc.bellcore.com

>
>Walt
>----
>Walt Spector
>(wws@renaissance.cray.com)
>Sunnyvale, California
>_._ _._ _..... _._ _._

End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #204
